

Application No. 09/844,251  
Filed: April 27, 2001  
TC Art Unit: 2832  
Confirmation No.: 8919

REMARKS

In the most recent Office Action, claims 12-15 and 20 were examined. Claims 12, 15 and 20 are rejected. Claims 13 and 14 are objected to.

In response, claims 12, 15 and 20 are amended. Accordingly, claims 12-15 and 20 are pending in the present application. No new matter is added.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough search and consideration of the invention recited in the pending claims, and responds to the comments in the Office Action as follows.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action states that claims 12 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Harnden, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,755,706). In particular, the Office Action states that Harnden, Jr. et al. disclose each and every element recited in claims 12 and 20. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The disclosure by Harnden, Jr. et al. is directed to a piezoelectric relay rather than a microswitch. Harnden, Jr. et al. appear to refer to permanently packaging a relay contact in an ambient atmosphere of an inert gas or a high dielectric strength

Application No. 09/844,251  
Filed: April 27, 2001  
TC Art Unit: 2832  
Confirmation No.: 8919

gas where the relay operates in the ambient atmosphere. However, Harnden, Jr. et al. fail to teach any type of process for manufacturing a contact of a microswitch, as is recited in claims 12. Instead, Harnden, Jr. et al. appear to refer to operation of a switch in a particular environment, rather than manufacturing a switch.

Claims 12 calls for the manufacture of a contact of a microswitch, and provides the process for the manufacture of the contact, which is complete prior to operation of the microswitch. Accordingly, claim 12 recites a number of elements not found in the disclosure by Harnden, Jr. et al. Because the cited prior art reference does not teach all the claim elements recited in claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is overcome, and respectfully requests that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites a semiconductor package with a semiconductor die with a microswitch formed on the surface thereof. The disclosure by Harnden, Jr. et al. fails to discuss any type of semiconductor package, semiconductor die or microswitch. At most, the disclosure by Harnden, Jr. et al. appears to refer to an integrated circuit used in conjunction with a piezoelectric relay. The integrated circuit is not a semiconductor circuit, nor is it a

Application No. 09/844,251  
Filed: April 27, 2001  
TC Art Unit: 2832  
Confirmation No.: 8919

semiconductor die. Accordingly, claim 20 recites a number of elements that are not found in the disclosure by Harnden, Jr. et al. Because claim 20 recites a number of elements that are not found in the cited prior art reference, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is overcome, and Applicant respectfully requests that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action states that claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,152) in view of Zavracky (U.S. Patent No. 5,638,946). In particular, the Office Action states that while Kim discloses all the elements of claim 15 with the exception of a contact formed of Ru, the same is taught by Zavracky in an obvious combination. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The disclosure by Kim is directed to a method for manufacturing an LCD panel. The disclosure by Kim is completely void of a microswitch or microswitch contact. In addition, the disclosure by Kim is completely silent with respect to a process for forming a microswitch contact. Indeed, the entire disclosure by Kim appears to be completely unrelated to microswitch technology and neither instructs, suggest or motivates one of

Application No. 09/844,251  
Filed: April 27, 2001  
TC Art Unit: 2832  
Confirmation No.: 8919

ordinary skill in the art on any process for forming a microswitch contact.

The disclosure by Zavracky is similarly silent with respect to a process for forming a contact on a microswitch that includes temporarily exposing the contact to oxygen plasma to reduce contact resistance. Accordingly, neither of the disclosures by Kim nor Zavracky teach or suggest all the elements of claim 15, either alone or in combination with each other. Because the cited prior art references do not teach or suggest the invention recited in claim 15, either alone or in combination, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome, and respectfully requests that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In addition, Applicant notes that it would not be obvious to combine the references or modify their teachings to arrive at the invention recited in claim 15. The disclosure by Kim provides no teaching, suggestion or motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to address the field of art involving microswitch contacts, and therefore clearly cannot be said to be combinable with Zavracky. In addition, the disclosure by Kim appears to indicate a decreased resistance through an organic layer of an LCD panel, which clearly fails to suggest or even contemplate the use of Ru,

Application No. 09/844,251  
Filed: April 27, 2001  
TC Art Unit: 2832  
Confirmation No.: 8919

or especially the use of any type of microswitch. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is nonobvious over the cited prior art references of Kim and Zavracky, either alone or in combination, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 13 and 14 if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 14 depend upon an allowable independent claim, and therefore should be allowable for all the same reasons as the independent claims, and also because of the additional recitations found in claims 13 and 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests notice to the effect of allowance of claims 13 and 14.

#### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicits notice to that effect. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned

Application No. 09/844,251  
Filed: April 27, 2001  
TC Art Unit: 2832  
Confirmation No.: 8919

attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of  
the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD H. MORRISON, JR. ET AL.

By: Brendan J. Kennedy  
Brendan J. Kennedy  
Registration No. 41,890  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,  
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP  
Ten Post Office Square  
Boston, MA 02109  
Telephone: (617) 542-2290  
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

BJK/dmc

334918.1